



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

V.—*On the Physical and Mental Characteristics of the European and Asiatic Races of Man.* By JOHN CRAWFURD, ESQ., F.R.S.

[Read February 13th, 1866.]

THE principal races of man in Europe may be considered as of nearly equal quality, and as having attained nearly the same state of civilisation. The races of Asia, on the contrary, differ greatly among themselves in quality, and are in very diverse states of civilisation. Thus, in physical and mental quality and in social status, there exists no broad difference between a German and a Spaniard, or between a Slave and an Italian, while virtually the same religious opinions prevail over all the people of Europe. It is very different with the people of Asia, as we see in the examples of the Arab and Hindoo, in the Burmese and Chinese, and in the Mongol and the Japanese. In comparing the races of Asia with those of Europe, I shall therefore refer only to those characters that are common to them.

In instituting a comparison between different races of the human family, we must, since we know nothing to the contrary, consider them all as of equal antiquity, or, in other words, as having had, in so far as mere time is concerned, an equal opportunity of social advancement. Conditions of physical geography, as they are favourable or adverse, will make a great difference in the progress made by races even of equal quality; but, due allowance made for these, the amount of civilisation reached must evidently depend wholly on the degree of natural capacity.

With the races of Europe I shall compare those of Asia which, at one epoch or another, have attained the highest civilisation. These are the Egyptians, essentially an Asiatic people, although by the accident of geographical position an African one; the Assyrians or Chaldeans, the Persians, the Hindus, the Chinese, the Hindu-Chinese, the Japanese, and the Malays as exemplified by the people of Java.

The physical geography of Europe affords few examples of localities so favourable to an early social development as the sites in which the civilisation of the Asiatic races just enumerated sprang up. These sites were the valley of the Nile, of the Tigris and Euphrates, of the Ganges, of the Blue and Yellow Rivers in China, of the well-watered and fertile valleys of Japan, of the valleys of the Irawadi and Menam in Burmah and Siam, and of the fertile

valleys of the volcanic island of Java. To these Asiatic sites of ancient civilisation there is nothing comparable in Europe, unless it be the Italian Peninsula.

All the Asiatic localities here enumerated were distinguished by their extent, by the fertility of their soil, by facility for irrigation, and even by facility of intercommunication. They were probably also, like the American prairies, unencumbered with forest, and hence free from what we know by experience to be one of the main obstacles to progress with early and therefore rude and feeble man. In all these localities, too, we may well believe that the plants and animals amenable to culture and domestication, and indispensable to civilisation, existed in the wild state.

For the development of early civilisation, Europe possessed but few of the advantages of the Asiatic countries referred to. The greater part of it was covered with forest; instead of a mild climate it had a rigorous one. It had probably in the wild state several of the animals amenable to domestication, but few of the plants capable of culture. The only advantage which it possessed over the Asiatic countries with which I am comparing it consisted in its greater extent of sea-coast, which would have yielded to its inhabitants an ample supply of fish, and some advantages of intercommunication. Greece and Italy, from their fertile well-watered lands and mild climates, were the portions of Europe which bore the nearest resemblance to the seats of early Asiatic civilisation, and it was in these that civilisation was first developed.

The differences in physical form between the European and Asiatic races of man are broad and clear, and may be thus stated: The European is a larger animal, possessing more bodily strength, with a great capacity for enduring toil. The limbs of the European are larger than those of the Asiatic, more especially the hands. The muscular fibres and joints of the European are comparatively rigid, while those of the Asiatic are supple and flexible. The most natural attitude of the European is to stand erect, that of the Asiatic to sit, and when he sits his flexible legs are tucked under him, a position of the body irksome or painful to the European. The flexibility of fibre which thus distinguishes the Asiatic from the European has been supposed by some to be the result of a warm climate; but this notion is contradicted by the fact that it belongs equally to the Chinese in the fortieth degree of latitude and in the eighteenth, to the Japanese under the thirtieth and under the fortieth parallel, to the Hindu within and beyond the tropic, and to the Malay under the Equator, as well as to the same people twenty degrees beyond it.

When the European walks he does so with a free and elastic

step, as if he had enjoyment in the very movement. When the Asiatic walks, he seems as if he did so only from necessity. The very dance of the European is a comparatively gay and active movement, while that of the Asiatic is ever a solemn measured strut. The late Mr. Mill, the distinguished philosophical historian of India, hazarded an opinion that the delicacy of some of the manipulations of the Hindus, as in the example of their fine muslins, was attributable to the delicate softness of their hands; but this is a mistake, for many works of such exquisite delicacy, as neither Hindu nor Chinese can reach, are executed by the large, coarse, rigid hand of the European artisan.

The complexion of the European is a white of various tints; that of the Asiatic always more or less swarthy, varying from the brownish-yellow of the Chinese up to the black of the majority of Hindus. The hair of the head with the European is fine in texture, disposed to buckle or curl, and is of every shade of colour from flaxen to black. With the Asiatic the hair of the head is lank, coarse in texture, and, with few exceptions, of the one black colour. The colour of the eye with the European is various, following that of the hair—grey, brown, blue, hazel, black. It is, with rare exceptions, black only with all the Asiatic races.

Beauty and symmetry of person would seem to decrease as we proceed from West to East. The Persians are less handsome than the Georgians and Mingrelians, and the Hindus much inferior in this respect to the Persians. The Hindus, again, far surpass the Chinese, who, ill-favoured as they are, are exceeded by the Coreans, Kamschadales, and Curile islanders.

The differences in the intellectual and moral qualities of the European and Asiatic races are of far more importance than those in their mere bodily structures, and deserve to be considered at greater length. In understanding, in judgment, in taste, in invention, in reach of imagination, in enterprise, in perseverance, and in the moral sense, the European, placed under equally favourable conditions, is greatly superior to the Asiatic. But the Asiatic is far more precocious than the European. He emanates sooner from savagery and barbarism; but, having reached a certain point of civilisation, his progress becomes nearly stationary. This character, which belongs to the Asiatic races collectively, is found in the individual; and ample means have been found, in our endeavours to educate our Indian subjects, of bringing this fact to the proof. In our seminaries, in which native and European children are educated together, it has been found that the natives advance as rapidly as Europeans, if not indeed more so, up to the age of puberty, after which the equality or superiority of the native ceases, and at eighteen he is left far behind, and never after recovers his lost ground.

A rapid sketch of the progress made by the two classes of races in arts, in arms, and in letters, will best illustrate the positions which I have now assumed. I begin with agriculture. When Greeks were yet but fishermen, and the inhabitants of Gaul, Germany, and Britain little better than hunters practising a rude husbandry, much, indeed, below Mexicans and Peruvians, the Egyptians, the Assyrians, the Hindus, and the Chinese possessed an agriculture which fed those millions who constructed gigantic tombs, temples, and fortifications. The agriculture of Egypt, of India, and of China has probably undergone little change for at least 3,000 years. We can speak most confidently of that of the Egyptians, since the cattle, the implements, and processes represented on their monuments are the same with those in use at the present day. The Asiatic plough consists of a single crooked beam, with a sock, but without coulter or earth-board. It is drawn by the slow ox, and never by the horse. In Asiatic husbandry the Chinese and Japanese adopted manures certainly unknown to the rude inhabitants of early Europe. The Hindus were the discoverers of cotton as a textile material, the discoverers of the indigo dye, and among the first to discover the art, never invented by Greek or Romans, of extracting a crystallised saccharine matter from the sap of plants. Either they or the Chinese were also the first cultivators of rice, that corn which now nourishes, perhaps, one-half the human race; yet even here, in so far as quality is concerned, they are excelled by Europeans, as in the example of Italy and Anglo-America. The Chinese were the discoverers of raw silk, and the curious fabrics made from it. But in the production of every one of the commodities now enumerated, both Hindus and Chinese are far surpassed by Europeans—in some cases even on their own soil, and before their very faces.

That the Asiatic races had made a very early progress in the mechanic arts is attested by the remains of their architectural monuments, which imply the existence at the time they were built of skilful quarriers, of brickmakers, of masons, of carpenters, and of ropemakers. Some of the Egyptian monuments, for example, have been estimated to be 5,000 years old, which would carry us three-and-twenty centuries beyond the time of Homer, when even the art of writing was unknown to the Greeks. All the ordinary metals seem to have been early known to the principal Asiatic races. Thus, the immemorably obsolete Sanskrit has indigenous names for gold, silver, copper, iron, tin, mercury, and lead. China possessed even zinc, a metal unknown to Greeks and Romans. All the other metals, either long known or recently discovered by Europeans, such as antimony, bismuth, and manganese, are, to the present day, wholly unknown to all the nations

of Asia. The state in which iron, the most useful of all the metals, and without which, unless we except Egypt, no effective civilisation has ever existed, is found among the people of Asia, is a striking example of the stationary condition of the arts among them. They probably invented the art of making iron malleable for ages before it was known to the nations of Europe ; but it is probably at present nearly what it was when first discovered, and there is not a hundred weight of good malleable iron in all Asia, which is at present largely supplied from Europe. A Hindu furnace will yield in a year little more than twenty tons of malleable iron, while an English one, in the same time, yields about 7,800 tons. The Hindu furnace is so rude that it is easy to believe that no material improvement has been effected in it since its first construction.

In manufacturing industry the Chinese are far ahead of all other Asiatic people. They were the inventors of silk, of porcelain, and of paper ; and all these inventions are of such antiquity that there is no record of their first discovery. The Chinese were clothed in silk when Greeks and Romans had no other textile fabric than a coarse one made of wool. They were in possession of porcelain when the most civilised people of Europe had nothing but unglazed earthenware ; and they had true paper when Europeans were obliged to put up with imperfect and expensive papyrus. In every one of these fabrics they are now far surpassed by Europeans. The Hindus were the discoverers of the cotton manufacture and of calico-printing ; but in both arts they have been far excelled by Europeans, who now supply the inventors with a large portion of the cotton fabrics which they consume. The Arabs were the discoverers of the singular process by which an agreeable stimulating beverage is extracted from the berries of the coffee plant ; but, notwithstanding the wide scope of their adventures, they never extended the culture of that plant beyond their own national limits. But the plant has been conveyed to the colonies of European nations ; and the once obscure Arabian berry has become, through the enterprise of Europeans, one of the great staples of the commerce of nations.

In no department of industry are the superior skill and enterprise of the European over the Asiatic races more striking than in trade and navigation. With the exception of the Phœnicians, who were, as I have on former occasions noticed, Asiatics only geographically, the active spirit of maritime enterprise never actuated the great races of Asia. It did not exist among the Egyptians, the Persians, or the Assyrians, and it was but very feebly displayed by the Hindus and Chinese. It never actuated the Arabs until they were driven onward by the enthusiasm of a new religion, and after conquest had brought them into commu-

nication with Europeans, who imparted to them some portion of their own enterprise and knowledge.

Down to the present time there is nothing in Asiatic history to be compared to the trade and colonies which Greece, a country not larger than Portugal, established twenty-five years ago over the coasts of the Mediterranean and Euxine. I need not contrast the present condition of trade and navigation between the two classes of race. Europeans, and not Asiatics, were the discoverers of the mariner's compass, of the pump, of the processes and instruments for determining latitude and estimating longitude—of the means, in a word, of enabling the mariner to cross broad seas in safety without the guidance of the dry land. At present by far the greater part of the external trade of the nations of Asia from the Bosphorus to Japan is carried on by the mariners and shipping of Europe. Such external trade as the sluggish races of Asia carried on with each other before the advent of Europeans, they owed to the monsoons alone, which once a year gave them a steady fair wind in their outward and homeward voyages.

Letters and literature afford perhaps the most striking illustrations of the broad disparity which exists in the intellectual characters of the European and Asiatic races. It was only the two most forward people of Europe, the Greeks and Italians, that invented letters, and even the Greeks are supposed to have received the first rudiments of theirs from the Phœnicians. The Greeks, indeed, are believed to have been unacquainted with written language until two centuries after the time of Homer, or 600 years before the birth of Christ. The precociousness of the Asiatic races is shown by the earlier invention of written language among them, and the frequency with which the discovery was made at many independent points. By those who have given their attention to the subject, written language was practised by the Egyptians, not by hundreds, but by thousands of years before it was known to the Greeks. We have, then, and of immemorial antiquity, the Phœnician or Hebrew alphabet, the cuneiform letters of the Chaldeans, the many distinct alphabets of India Proper, of the Indo-Chinese countries, and of the Malay and Philippine Archipelagos, with the symbolic characters of China adopted by the adjacent countries of Anam and Japan. Such is the antiquity of all these inventions, and the rudeness of the times in which they were made, that in no instance can we assign a date to their origin any more than we can to the first discovery of the art of kindling a fire or of fashioning a stone axe. We judge them, however, to be separate and distinct inventions by the totally distinct form of the letters of the different alphabets, and by the opposite principles on which many of them are constructed.

The art of printing with movable types is a European invention that has been in general use by all the nations of Europe for four centuries; but up to the present time it has not been adopted by any Asiatic people, except under the presence or influence of Europeans. They prefer to it, and this is quite Asiatic, the tedious and uncertain penmanship of their ancestors, so that in this matter their literature is in the same condition as was our own five centuries ago. The Chinese, as they were the inventors of paper, were so also of stereotype printing, executed with wooden blocks. Beyond this first step they have not advanced either in the manufacture of paper or in the art of printing, both of which are of immemorial existence in China, whence they have been extended to Anam and Japan.

As to literature, the most enthusiastic oriental scholar will not deny the immeasurable superiority of that of Europe over that of Asia. With the exception of their mere possession of the art of writing, there exists no evidence to show that the ancient Egyptians, Assyrians, and Persians had any literature at all: indeed, but for the relics of their monuments, the hints we have of them in the Hebrew Scriptures, and the narratives of the Greeks and Romans, we should not now have known that such people ever existed. The true history of Persia begins with the conquest of the country by the Arabians in the seventh century of our own time, and the greatest and oldest work in Persian literature, the *Shahnameh*, or *Book of Kings*, dates only from the eleventh century. This consists of a series of wild romances of imaginary heroes, and is of such slender merit that no orientalist has ever ventured on presenting it in a European translation. The Arabs were an obscure people until, under the inspiration of a new religion, borrowed from the Jewish and Christian, they were impelled to migration and conquest in the beginning of the seventh century of our time. They produced almost at once the Koran, considered by themselves the best production of their literature; so that in twelve centuries' time they cannot be said to have made any material literary advance.

The oldest work of the Hindus is the earliest of their Vedas, or collection of hymns, and European scholars have estimated this production as not less than 3,000 years old, that is, 1,200 years before the birth of Christ, which would make it about three centuries older than the poems of Homer. The Hindus have produced besides two bulky poems, which have been called epics, the *Mahabarata* and *Ramayana*. These are of great antiquity, but of unascertained date, and among Hindus, and all who have received religion from the Hindus, are as famous as are the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* among the nations of Europe; but it is needless to add that these wild, incongruous, and preternatural fictions bear little analogy to the poems of Homer.



The Hindus have also produced dramas admitted by the best judges to be of higher merit than their "epics," and of some of these we have English translations. The originals of both epics and dramas are written in the dead Sanskrit. Works of fiction such as these must have been written for a people who understood them—that is, by a nation whose current language was Sanskrit immemorially obsolete—for we cannot suppose that works of imagination should have been written in India in a dead tongue, any more than we can suppose Virgil and the Roman dramatists writing in Greek, or Dante and Chaucer in Latin. We can indeed readily suppose that treatises on law, religion, and science might have been written by the Hindus in a dead tongue as the nations of Europe did in Latin, but surely not writings meant for the people. This fact carries us back to a period of great antiquity in the history of the Hindus, although we can assign no date to it.

In corroboration of this antiquity, and as further evidence of the stationary character of Hindu civilisation, a striking fact may be added. In none of the many vulgar tongues of India has any work been produced of equal merit with those written in Sanskrit; and, indeed, the literature of the vernacular languages consists only of translations or paraphrases of Sanskrit works. The Sanskrit is admitted to have been the language of a foreign people, and it will follow that ever since it ceased to be a spoken language, Hindu literature has been stationary.

The earliest literary production of the Chinese dates 500 years before the birth of Christ. This is a treatise on ethics, the work of Confucius, and is considered by the Chinese themselves to be their greatest literary achievement, so that we must consider them, in so far as letters are concerned, as having remained stationary for near five-and-twenty centuries. It was at the time that Confucius wrote the treatise in question, that Herodotus, who was ignorant of the existence of the Chinese, began to write true history.

There is, however, it ought to be observed, one notable exception to the inferiority of Asiatic literature. This consists in certain portions of the Hebrew Scriptures, which, for pathos and sublimity, are at least equal to the greatest productions of ancient or modern Europe. The inspiration in this case proceeded from a Phœnician people, one of mental qualification very different from, and of a far higher type than, that of Egyptians, Assyrians, Persians, Arabs, Hindus, or Chinese—a people, indeed, that for vigour and strength of character were more European than Asiatic, although partaking of the character of both.

As to the fine arts, sculpture, painting, and music, they exist among the races of Asia only in the rudest and most rudimentary

form. Three-and-twenty centuries ago, the Greeks carried statuary to perfection, and they have been imitated, although not equalled, by the various races of Europe, down to our own time, nature being always the model aimed at. The statuary of Egypt, of Assyria, and of India Braminical and Buddhist, is formed on conventional models which admit of neither variety nor improvement. For the most part, the objects represented are mythological personages, or living kings nearly as much worshipped as gods. In Hindu statuary, for example, one Hindu deity is represented with three eyes, another with four arms, and a third has an elephant's head on the body of a man. Buddha, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, sits cross-legged, in the attitude of a European tailor. These forms are invariable. Asiatic painting is on a yet lower footing than sculpture, and has the same conventional character : it is, indeed, miserable daubing, of which a village sign-painter in Europe would be ashamed. Among those who have adopted the Mahomedan religion, and they are nearly all of Asiatic blood, statuary and painting, can, indeed, have no proper place at all ; for, in imitation of the Jews, not only the representation of the human form, but of all animal life whatsoever, is expressly forbidden as sheer impious idolatry. Music, as a science, is wholly unknown to the races of Asia. The Persians have a few pleasing melodies, but the Hindus and Chinese have the musical faculty in so low a degree as to amount to a physical defect ; and, civilised as they are, it may be safely asserted that their music does not surpass that of African Negros, and is certainly much inferior to that of the Malayan race, in civilisation so much below them.

There is no department of art which exhibits in so striking and satisfactory a light the contrast between the genius of Europe and of Asia as architecture, with the allied arts of road-making, canals, bridges, and fortifications. We have in this case the advantage in many instances of having the monuments themselves before us, and this over a range of thousands of years. The Pyramids of Egypt were seen and described by Herodotus some 2500 years ago, and they were then considered, as they now are, of fathomless antiquity. If we but double the period which has elapsed since the time of Herodotus, some of the Egyptian Pyramids must approach an antiquity of 5000 years.

The characteristics of European architecture are beauty of form and proportion, with design to some purpose of use or ornament. Those of Asiatic consist of magnitude, solidity, and durability, often without any purpose of usefulness or ornament. Of this we have examples in the Pyramids and temples of Egypt, in the palaces and walls of Babylon and Nineveh, in the huge caves and other temples of the Hindus, and in the monster wall of China.

The pyramid of Cheops occupies a space of thirteen acres, or twice the area of St. Peter's. Modern engineers have estimated the value of the labour expended on it at £2,000,000, which is about threefold the estimated cost of all the Athenian buildings and structures of Pericles in an administration of between forty and fifty years. The pyramid of Cheops may have been intended for the tomb of the despot who built it, or for a less mischievous animal, a deified ox.

The Great Wall of China, built 200 years before the Christian era, is 1200 miles in length, from 20 to 25 feet in height, and 15 to 20 feet in breadth. The object which it aimed at, but never effected, was to protect the industrious but timid Chinese from the inroads of the hardy shepherds of Tartary. On it, probably, was wasted as much labour as was expended on all the Pyramids and temples of Egypt put together. Let the Pyramids of Cheops or the Chinese wall be compared with a Roman aqueduct or a modern railway, or even a modern canal, and we have emblems of the respective genius of the European and Asiatic races of man. The comparison would not, indeed, be a fair one if the Egyptians and Chinese had made great progress since the building of the structures in question; but, although they have not been absolutely stationary, there is little evidence of material advancement. They existed then an ingenious people skilled in the arts according to the standard of Asiatic civilisation, and the utmost that can be predicated is that their descendants are now a little more skilful.

As to the architecture of the Arabs, it is unquestionably of a far higher type than that of any other Asiatic people. But the Arabs had no architecture of their own, and what goes under their name originated in an imitation, not indeed of the pure Greek, but of the Byzantine, that is, of the art of Greeks whose taste had been vitiated by intermixture with Asiatic races. In time they made it their own, such as it now exists in Rumelia, in Spain, and in India. For this view of Arabian architecture I have the highest living authority, that of my friend James Fergusson, the well-known author of the *Handbook of Architecture*.

Of science, or of arts founded on ascertained principles, it cannot be said that it has any existence at all among the nations of Asia. With them everything is empirical and traditional. The nations of Europe owe to the Hindus their numerals, and their system of numeral notation. Probably, also, they owe to them the week of seven days; but these discoveries came to those who received them, not by immediate communication, but through indirect and obscure channels, the recipients being unconscious of their obligations. The Greeks are stated to have received their weights, measures, and moneys from their more precocious

Asiatic neighbours, the Lydians and Phœnicians. I am aware that a certain acquaintance with geometry, algebra, and astronomy has been ascribed to the Hindus as their own special discoveries. On the last of these topics, certain tables have been found in India, implying an advance in astronomy equal to what was reached in Europe in the twelfth century. European astronomers are divided in opinion respecting their origin, some considering them as borrowed directly or indirectly from the Greeks, and others concluding them of native origin. It seems to me that the first of these views is the most reasonable. The astronomical observations recorded could not have been made without such instruments as the Greeks certainly possessed two centuries before the Christian era, but no such instruments are asserted ever to have been found among the Hindus—a people, indeed, whose mechanical skill, even at the present day, and after acquiring much from their conquerors, is so poor that they are even incapable of fabricating a common time-keeper.

But, besides this, the Hindu astronomical tables have neither date nor authorship. That the European and Hindu astronomy had a common origin, seems to be certain, even from the arbitrary division of the Zodiac into twelve parts, the figures representing them, with the order of their arrangement, being the same, and even their names being but translations. I have in my possession Hindu sacrificial bronze cups, found in the ruins of ancient Hindu temples of the remote island of Java, on which the signs of the Zodiac are represented, such as I now describe them. These cups contain authentic dates in figures, which carry us back to the beginning of the fourteenth century.

If the astronomy of the Hindus was borrowed from strangers, the Greeks of Bactria seem to be the most likely source from which it was derived. Their kingdom lasted for two centuries after the death of its founder; its sovereigns coined Greek money, and had possessions even in India, while the colonists maintained an occasional intercourse with their parent country. But whether the geometry and astronomy found among the Hindus were of native or of foreign origin seems very immaterial, since, buried in a dead language, and confined to a small number of the priesthood, they could have exercised no influence on the mass of society. As to the argument founded on the exclusiveness of the Hindus, and their reluctance to borrow from strangers, I think it must be of the smallest value when we consider how much of foreign languages, and consequently of foreign ideas, they have admitted within the last seven centuries, to say nothing of what they could not fail to have received in earlier times from intercommunication with Persian and Greek settlers not remote from their borders.

With regard to the indigenous astronomy of China, it was so

imperfect, that ever since the Chinese have had intercourse with Europeans, they have found it necessary to employ the latter in the construction of their almanacs. The geometry and astronomy of the Arabians were confessedly derived from the Greeks: the Arabs did, in fact, no more than translate or paraphrase Greek writings, to obtain their information.

But of all subjects the art of war is that which proclaims the loudest the incomparable superiority, both physical and intellectual, of the European over the Asiatic races. It was displayed from the earliest time that they came into collision, and has continued to be so down to our own time. The ancient Persians, at the time a warlike and conquering people, had subdued all the nations of Asia from India to the Mediterranean, but were driven back and routed by a few small Greek states, which had by good fortune united for this exclusive purpose. In the Greek victories of Marathon, Platea, and Salamis, the Persians are reckoned to have been to the Greeks as five to one. Such was the result of the encounter of the two races some five-and-twenty centuries ago.

When the Greeks came to be united and under an able leader, they not only conquered the Persians, but all the nations which Persia had subdued from the Bosphorus to the Indus. In all these cases, the achievements of the Greeks were accomplished by mere handfuls of men compared with such hosts as those with which Xerxes and Darius had invaded the little territory of Greece. "In this comparison," says Mr. Grote, "between the invasion of Xerxes and that of Alexander, we contrast the progressive spirit of Greece, serving as a herald and stimulus to the like spirit in Europe, with the stationary mind of Asia, occasionally roused by some splendid individual, but never appropriating to itself new social ideas or powers, either for war or for peace."

The Russians are by race Europeans, but not in the van of European civilisation, and yet they have won easy and great victories over the most warlike of the Asiatic nations, the Turks and Persians, wresting from both large and valuable portions of their dominions, their conquests being arrested only by the interference of the other nations of Europe.

A small combined French and English army lately captured the capital of the Chinese Empire, and dictated treaties to the lord of reputedly 400 millions of subjects. The Chinese are at least six times as numerous as the French and English put together, and they were a civilised people when their European conquerors were sheer barbarians. To place Asiatics on a parity with Europeans, we must fancy a Chinese fleet and army capturing Paris and London, and dictating peace to France and England.

But our own conquest of Hindustan, with its 200 millions of people, with substantially its peaceable possession for the century

which has elapsed since the first effectual conquest, affords the most signal example of the superiority of the European races over the Asiatic. The battle of Plassy was gained by a much smaller proportion of the conquerors to the vanquished than were those of Marathon and Platea. Since that battle our means of carrying on war have vastly increased, for we have invented the steam engine, steam navigation, and the electric telegraph, while compared to our present cannon the artillery of Clive were but popguns. What have the nations of Asia done in the century which has elapsed? They have increased in numbers, but in all else stood stock still, and are nearly the same now as they were in the sixteenth century.

I do not know of a more signal example of the military superiority of Europeans over Asiatics than is to be found in the history of the Mamelooks. This force consisted originally of Georgians, Circassians, and Mingrelians—that is, of an European race, although dwelling within the geographical limits of Asia. In course of time, they came to be occasionally recruited from the nations of Southern Europe. A sultan of Egypt, who had noted the superior military virtues of the European races, instituted the corps of Mamelooks in 1230; and although their number never exceeded 14,000, they may be said to have virtually governed Egypt and Syria until destroyed by the great Napoleon in the last years of the past century—that is, for 570 years. In the curious travels of Ludovico Barthema at the beginning of the sixteenth century, there is a striking instance of the superiority of these Mamelooks worth transcribing. The traveller is on his way to Mecca with the pilgrim caravan, and is himself enrolled in the Mamelook guard which was its escort. “When we halted,” says he, “at the said waters, we had to fight with a vast number of Arabs (Bedouins), but they never killed more than one man and one lady, for such is the baseness of their minds that our sixty Mamelooks were sufficient defence against 40,000 or 50,000 Arabs: for pagans, there are no better people with arms in their hands than are the Mamelooks.”

Gunpowder and fire-arms, European inventions of comparatively rude times, became known to the nations of Asia some three centuries after they had been in use in Europe, but their introduction has by no means improved the relative position of the races adopting them. The Hindus and Persians have imitated the tactics and organisation of the armies of Europe to little purpose. Forty thousand Sepoys, disciplined by ourselves, but deprived of the European officers who alone gave them spirit, cohesion, and confidence, got by chance possession of a well-provided and fortified arsenal; but Delhi was besieged, stormed, and captured by a European force which did not exceed one-eighth part of the number of the mutineer garrison. The battalions of Persia with European or-

ganisation have been easily overthrown by the Russian, and those of the Princes of India by the English infantry.

The favourite arm of Asiatic nations is artillery; for to stand behind great guns inspires the Asiatic soldiery with a confidence which discipline refuses to confer. They have, indeed, often shown themselves expert artillerymen, and their cannoneers have always been the last to give way before an European force. The Indian artillery in our service used to be a fine-looking body of men, equal in stature to Europeans. The late General Macleod, a skilful and experienced officer of the Indian artillery, told me that, in so far as speed of firing was concerned, he had tried an equal number of Indian against English artillerymen, and the result was that for the first quarter of an hour the Indians fired shot for shot with the English, but that before half an hour was completed the English fired two shots to one of the Indians. A tall Indian horse will at least keep up with a small Arab for a quarter of a mile in a heat of two miles, but will probably be distanced before the race is over. Something very similar to this is the disparity between the Asiatic and the European.

In the matter of government there has ever existed a wide difference between Europe and Asia. In Europe there have existed republics, aristocracies, mixed monarchies, and monarchies, always with more or less of responsibility on the part of the governors to the governed. With the principal nations of Asia the only form of government which has ever existed has been a pure despotism, in which the sovereign is, in theory at least, the absolute master of the life, liberty, labour, and property of the people; the only checks on his power being religion, vague custom, and fear of insurrection. A tyrant is dethroned for flagrant and intolerable misgovernment, and some temporary amelioration follows, but he is in due time sure to be succeeded by another tyrant, to be in his turn dethroned in a bloody revolution.

I have no doubt but that the greatest improvements which have taken place in the governments of Asia have proceeded from foreign conquest. Thus, there can be little hesitation in believing that the conquests of the Greeks under Alexander and his successors improved the administration of the countries which the Greeks subverted. The conquest of Persia and Turkomania by the Arabs improved the governments of those countries, and upon the whole the dominion of the Caliphs was the most enlightened which Asia had hitherto experienced. There is abundant evidence to show that the governments of the Hindus were improved even by the tribes of Persians, Turks, and Afghans who subdued them. It may be said without presumption or the indulgence of national vanity, that, with all its shortcomings, the best government which Asia has ever witnessed is that which has

resulted from our own conquests in Hindustan. Next to it are the governments established in the great Asiatic islands by two other European people, the Dutch and Spaniards. In every direction, then, we see evidence of the immeasurable superiority of the European races.

The gigantic monuments raised to pride, superstition, or folly, erected by the principal, and indeed often even by second-rate Asiatic nations, attest the uncontrolled despotism of Asiatic sovereigns and the virtual slavery of their subjects. The great pyramid of Cheops took twenty years to build, and 100,000 labourers were all the time constantly employed upon it. The canal of Necho, as illusory as the canal of Lesseps, and which was to have connected the Pelusian branch of the Nile with the Red Sea, is stated to have been executed at the cost of 120,000 lives. The periphery of the outer wall of Babylon, for it had also an inner one, was 130 miles; its height from 300 to 400 feet, and its width eighty feet; so that we can readily understand how much labour it must have cost. Yet Babylon was conquered by the rude Persians in the first flush of their conquests, and the capture of the city was the same thing as the conquest of the Assyrian empire. The 1200 miles wall of China, with its many towers and many gates, was a greater work than any of these, which implies only a greater waste of labour. The people of Europe who in matters of government most resemble Asiatics, the Russians, are the only one who have a despotic command over the labour of its subjects. In laying the foundations of St. Petersburg in a marsh, Peter the Great is said to have wasted the lives of 100,000 of his subjects, collected from every corner of his empire; but even here there was at least a pretence of utility. "That," observes Mr. Grote, in his *History of Greece*, "which strikes us most, and which must have struck the first Grecian visitors much more, both in Assyria and Egypt, is the unbounded command of naked human strength possessed by their early kings, and the effect of mere mass and indefatigable perseverance, unaided by theory or by artifice in the accomplishment of gigantic works."

Among the disparities in matters of government which exist between the races of Europe and Asia, the vigilant jealousy of strangers entertained by the latter is especially remarkable. This is a feeling evidently arising from distrust in themselves and apprehension of loss of power through innovation, with an inward consciousness of the superiority of strangers. It was not until the seventh century before Christ, and long after the Egyptians had attained the summit of their civilisation, that they permitted the Greeks and Phœnicians to carry on trade with them; and even then it was tolerated only under stringent restrictions as to time and residence. The same jealousy exists even now among all the



nations of Asia to the eastward of Bengal, and has indeed been but partially overcome by force of European arms. The Chinese and Japanese governments, while they are only apprehensive of the loss of their own power, veil their fears by an affected contempt of foreign trade, by no means shared by their subjects.

Among the salient results of Asiatic despotism may be mentioned the general absence of individuality of character. Private character seems to be absorbed and lost in the common mass of servility, so that an Asiatic commonwealth may to some degree be compared to a troop of gregarious animals, in which the whole power is possessed by a few of the stronger males. The names of only a small number of conquerors, of lawgivers, and of founders of religious sects are known even in their own country, and still fewer in the outer world. The architects and engineers who built the pyramids and temples of Egypt, the walls and palaces of Babylon and Nineveh, the temples of India, and the monster wall of China, are wholly unknown. In literature the names of but a small number of authors are known, and this characteristic seems aggravated after quitting Persia and European influence. With the Hindus it is very general: we are ignorant, for example, of the names of the authors of their two greatest poems. It is needless to insist how different has been the case in ancient, in modern, and even in medieval Europe. Ever since the nations of Europe acquired the art of recording their own transactions, the names of illustrious persons, with regard to their social position, have been commemorated. Occasionally, tradition alone has sufficed to hand them down to posterity. It will not, indeed, be too much to say that Europe has produced more known illustrious women than Asia has of known illustrious men.

To Asiatic misrule, joined to Asiatic apathy, must, I think, be ascribed the dislike of innovation which resists improvement and proved an obstacle to the introduction of those discoveries which have enlightened the nations of Europe and increased their power. Among the nations of Europe, ever since the establishment of their present polity, a common understanding—a kind of public European opinion—has existed. There is a quick intercommunication and an adoption of each other's inventions and discoveries. One discovers the true theory of the planetary system; another, the telescope, the mariner's compass, the quarter-staff, and the quadrant; a third, the steam-engine, the improved machinery for spinning and weaving, steam navigation, the railroad, and the electric telegraph. Quickly these inventions become the common property of all.

No such community exists among the nations of Asia. Jealousy of each other confines their intercourse to a petty traffic at each other's borders, and, in general, whatever change one nation

effects in the social condition of another has been chiefly the result of conquest or religious conversion. The exceptions are but few. There is good reason to believe that the Chinese were the inventors of silk and paper. Silently, in unknown times, and by unknown agents, these discoveries were communicated to the nations of Central and Western Asia. The Chinese were the inventors of porcelain, but, excepting the Japanese, not a single people of Asia has even attempted to imitate them; their own rude unglazed earthenware being now in shape and in quality most probably little different from what it was 4000 years ago. Not so with Europeans, who have not only imitated, but far excelled, the porcelain of China. The Arabs were the discoverers of coffee and the curious process by which it is prepared for use, and in two brief centuries' time it became a common beverage among all the nations of Europe, while to this day it is as an article of consumption unknown to any nation of Asia east of Persia. Tea was a discovery of the Chinese, and in about the same length of time as coffee its use has become general among all the nations of Europe, while to all the nations west of China and Anam, Persia excepted, it is either very little known or altogether unknown. There are but two commodities of any importance that the Asiatic nations have adopted from America in the long course of time now approaching to four centuries. These, and they acquired them only through Europeans, are maize and tobacco, coarse easily-grown plants suited to many varieties of climate. The American potato, which sustains millions of the people of Europe, has hardly reached the nations of Asia at all, save where Europeans have settled.

In morals there has ever existed a wide difference between Europeans and Asiatics. Truth, the basis of all morality, has never distinguished the races of Asia. In Europe fidelity to engagements has been in esteem even in rude times, and increased with the advance of civilisation. Not so in Asia, for it may safely be asserted that there the most civilised nations are found to be the least truthful, among whom may be named the Persians, the Hindus, and the Chinese. Integrity is most prevalent among the educated classes in Europe; but, with the more civilised, the want of it pervades all classes in Asia. The European maxim that "honesty is the best policy" is not recognised by the more civilised people of Asia; on the contrary, finesse is substituted. It is only among Asiatic nations of the second order of civilisation, such as Burmese, Malays, etc., that we find an adherence to truth, and even they become demoralised on the attainment of power.

The difference in morals between Europeans and Asiatics seems to have belonged to all ages. The Romans prided themselves on

fidelity to their engagements in their best times, but lost this reputation for an opposite one, under the Lower Empire, when they came to be mixed with Asiatic races. The Carthaginians were a people of Asiatic origin; and, from the experience which the Romans had of them, "Punic faith" became a byword in their language for perfidy.

There is at least one example of integrity among Asiatic nations which deserves to be noticed. This refers to some of the higher mercantile classes, to whom the utility and even necessity of a strict integrity is directly brought home by their own experience.

Hindu bankers belong to this category, as do merchants engaged largely in the foreign trade. Among the Parsee, Hindu, and Mahomedan merchants of Bombay and Calcutta, and the Chinese merchants of Singapore, of Canton, and of Shanghai, there are to be found many men of exemplary integrity.

It may be pleaded that the untruthfulness of Asia has been the result of ages of bad government. This is, in a good measure, true; but, as the bad government sprang from themselves and was a creature of their own creation, they alone are answerable for its results. No good government ever arose in Asia from which good morals could have sprung, and therefore the infidelity of Asia must be considered as an affair more or less of race.

No better test of the state of morals among a people can be adduced than the relative condition of women to the stronger sex. From the earliest recorded times, women have, among the people of Europe, been on as near an equality with men as strength of body and mind and the different duties assigned to them by nature would allow, and this equality has always increased with the increase of civilisation. It has been the reverse in Asia, where women have ever been looked upon as but handmaids, the mere objects of sense, and the indispensable mothers of sons. The ancient laws of the Hindus spoke contemptuously of women, and Mahomed excluded them from his paradise, his prurient imagination supplying substitutes for them.

From this difference in the treatment of women have flowed the monogamy of Europe and the polygamy and legal concubinage of Asia. "Marriage," says Tacitus, speaking of the Germans, "is considered as a strict and sacred institution. In the national character there is nothing so truly commendable. To be contented with one wife is peculiar to the Germans. They differ in this respect from all other savage nations." What other savage nations Tacitus refers to here it is not easy to conjecture, for in his account of the Gauls and the Britons, he does not say that they differed in this respect from the Germans. "Lest," says he, continuing his account of the same people, "the wife should think her sex an exemption from the rigours of the severest virtue and

the toils of war, she is informed of her duty by the marriage ceremony, and thence she learns that she is received by her husband to be his partner in toil and danger, to dare with him in war, and suffer with him in peace." Monogamy was equally the rule among the civilised Greeks and Romans, the liberty of the fair sex, indeed, sometimes amounting to licentiousness.

In Europe, marriages have, for the most part, been contracted only when both parties to them have attained maturity, and the wife has had always more or less the power to choose a husband. In Asia marriages are entered into when the bride is a child under puberty and when the husband may be fifty, a condition which renders all approach to equality impossible. In Europe women have always appeared in public as the companions and equals of the stronger sex, and without attempt at jealous concealment. Among the ruder nations they have even accompanied their male relatives to the field of battle to encourage them by their voice and presence. They have distinguished themselves as authors, painters, and sculptors; they have even sat on thrones and distinguished themselves by their skill in government. Among the civilised nations of Asia, nothing of all this can happen. The women even in the domestic circle are not on an equality with the male sex, and among the upper and middle classes are immured, and would be so by the lower orders if it were practicable. They can not only not be seen by strangers, but it would amount to an insult to ask directly even after their health. The seclusion of women belongs to all the nations of Asia, from Persia to China and Japan, although with some relaxation with those of the second order of civilisation, such as the Burmese, the Javanese, the Anamites, and the Japanese. That this was the case in early times, just as it is now, we have information that is entirely authentic. Even the Greeks, who were less liberal in their treatment of women than the western and northern people of Europe, were surprised at the jealousy of the Asiatics. This is well expressed in the following passage of Plutarch:—"The barbarians in general," says he in his life of Themistocles, "especially the Persians, are jealous of their women even to madness, not only of their wives, but of their slaves and concubines; for besides the care they take that they be seen by none but their own family, they treat them like prisoners in their houses, and when they take a journey they are put in carriages closely covered on all sides." The account thus given of the treatment of women by Asiatics is as literally true at the present day as when it was written 1800 years ago, and without doubt as true as it was at the time it refers to—that is, some 2500 years back.

As to polygamy, there is no civilised country of Asia in which it does not exist, and no civilised country of Europe in which it

has ever had a general permanent existence. Christianity itself did not suffice to put an end to it in Asia, for in its first ages nearly all its votaries were Asiatic. It was only when it extended to the nations of Europe that polygamy incompatible with the frame of society ceased to be legal. When it is asserted that polygamy is the rule among Asiatic nations, it is needless to add that it is an institution which in its nature cannot pervade a whole society. The natural equality in the number of the sexes would make this impossible, unless we are to imagine that the majority of the men would be content to live without wives. If every man were to have no more than two wives, it is obvious that two females must exist for one male, which is contrary to the well-established fact of the close equality of the sexes. Polygamy is but the vicious indulgence of a small number, and limited by necessity to the very few who can afford to rear two or more families instead of one.

Among the evils of polygamy and concubinage are to be reckoned disputed successions, civil wars, and wholesale fratricides. In rude times we have had examples of these calamities in Europe, but they have been exceptions, while in Asia they have been the rule—a fact of which the Turks, Persians, and Mahomedans of India have afforded the most authentic examples. Thus, Aurungzebe, one of the wisest and ablest of the Moghul sovereigns of India, the cotemporary of all our Stuarts, of Cromwell, and of William of Orange, ascended the throne by the defeat and murder of three brothers, two of them his seniors, and by the incarceration for life of his father.

The different forms which the same religion takes among the races of Europe and of Asia show the wide and essential difference which exists in their characters. There are but three religions which are common to the races of Europe and Asia, and they all directly or indirectly originated with the same singular and highly endowed race, the Phœnician, a people, as already stated, physically and intellectually at least as much European as Asiatic. These religions, it is almost superfluous to add, are the Jewish, the Christian, and the Mahomedan. In social advancement the Jews of Europe are on a parity with the people of the communities among which they dwell. The Jews of Asia are substantially Persians among Persians, Arabs among Arabs, and difficult to distinguish from Hindus among Hindus. The Jews of Europe have advanced with the civilisation of Europe, while the Jews of Asia have remained stationary in conformity with the stationary civilisation of Asia.

The Christianity of Europe has kept pace with its civilisation, and varied in its character with that civilisation. The Christianity of the sixteenth century was a very different form of belief from

that of the fourth and of the tenth century; while the Christianity of our times differs very widely from that even of the sixteenth century—more humane, liberal, and beneficent. The Christians of Armenia, on the contrary, differ in social condition from the neighbouring Mahomedans of the Caucasus only in a few immaterial rites and tenets. The Christians of India, of Anam and China are not distinguishable from the Hindus, Anamites, and Chinese, among whom they live. The Spaniards have converted some five millions of the inhabitants of the Philippines to Christianity; but, after the lapse of three centuries, they are still essentially Malays.

The followers of the religion of Mahomed are nearly all Asiatics, and therefore we have no means of making a fair comparison of the effects of Mahomedanism on the European and Asiatic races. I may observe, however, that, at the first burst of its enthusiasm, Mahomedanism seems to have improved some races, and evidently deteriorated others. It improved the Arabs themselves, perhaps the Persians, certainly the Turks, and eminently so all the African Negroes who have adopted it. But it deteriorated the Syrians and Egyptians, while it has certainly done no good to the fair race of the Caucasus.

There is one matter connected with this subject in which the races of Asia would seem, at first view, to have an advantage over those of Europe. This is religious toleration. The bitter persecutions on account of difference of religious opinions which have characterised the people of Europe since the adoption of their present religion are unknown to the nations of Asia—to the Hindus, Chinese, and Japanese—in so far as religion is unconnected with politics. We have, at least, no authentic record of such persecutions. The spirit of proselytism, as far as we know, has never assumed an active character with the people of Asia: on the contrary, religion with them is considered a social hereditary privilege of which strangers are not to partake. But the same toleration prevailed with the ancient nations of civilised Europe; and the Romans, more especially, are described as adding to the worship of their own gods not only those of Greece, but even of Egypt. Religious persecution may safely be said to have commenced with that singular and energetic people, the Jews, who, in their zeal for the unity of the Deity, considered it a sacred duty not only to persecute but to destroy all idolaters. It was from the Jews that religious tolerance infected the people of Europe first, and some six centuries later the Arabs, who before appear to have been imbued with the same religious tolerance or indifference as the rest of the people of Asia. Even after the conversion of the Asiatic nations to Mahomedanism, their religious zeal has never carried them to the same lengths that once charac-

terised the nations of Europe. Among the Mahomedan sects thousands were not burned alive for differences of doctrine ; and even heathens and idolaters had the option of conversion or paying tribute. Apostates alone were punished with death, and even this was inflicted only by simple decapitation. Smithfield fires and Spanish *auto-da-fés* may safely be said to have had no place in the history of Mahomedanism.

Allied to this question is that of sorcery, or demonology. In one form or another it has prevailed among the races of Asia as it did at no very remote time among those of Europe. But the temporary madness which induced the people of Europe to condemn innocent old women to be burnt alive by thousands for an imaginary crime has never been known to the races of Asia. The real murders under the name of executions, both under this head and on account of differences in matters of religious doctrine, are to be ascribed, I imagine, to the greater intensity of the religious sentiment in the European races.

I shall conclude this paper by producing two examples of European and Asiatic races, placed under conditions of physical geography equally favourable, and these, I think it will be admitted, strikingly illustrate the dissimilitude which exists in the physical, intellectual, and moral characters of the peoples of Europe and Asia. The first of these will be a comparison between the inhabitants of the British and Japanese islands. These are of about the same extent, and reckoned to have about the same number of inhabitants. Both are extra-tropical, with winters, springs, summers, and autumns ; the Japanese Islands having the advantage of being some ten degrees nearer to the tropic, and hence capable of yielding commodities which the British Islands refuse to produce—such as rice, tea, cotton, and silk—while, at the same time, they yield all the staple products of the British climate. The Japanese Islands have immemorially possessed all the most useful of the domestic animals. Like the British Islands, the Japanese have mines of iron, copper, lead, and coal, and what the British Islands can scarcely be said to have, mines of gold and silver. Like the British, the Japanese Islands abound in good harbours, open throughout the year, and the seas which surround them are tempestuous, like the British, and therefore fit to exercise the skill, the courage, and the enterprise of a seafaring population. The Japanese seas and estuaries abound in fish, like the British ; the more northern parts of them, to make the resemblance in this respect the more complete, including the salmon and the herring.

So far the parallel is tolerably complete. The only essential difference lies in the races of man, and the results are shown in the very dissimilar states of the parties compared. We cannot

go back 2000 years in the history of Japan, because the Japanese have no authentic record of such antiquity ; but if as precocious as other Asiatic people, and there is no reason to believe that they are less so, they must have been a tolerably civilised people when our own ancestors were shepherds and huntsmen with less knowledge of agriculture and the useful arts than was possessed by the Mexicans and Peruvians when the Spaniards first saw them. The Japanese first became known to Europeans 322 years ago, and do not appear then to have differed in any appreciable respect from what they are at the present day. This is exactly the same thing as if in England no change whatever had taken place in arts, sciences, manners, customs, and government since the last year of the reign of King Henry VIII. The Japanese isolated themselves from the rest of the world for above 200 years, but even this made no change in them. The Japanese are, in short, an example of the stationary character of the Eastern races carried to the last extremity. We can readily imagine such a people undergoing very little change in thousands instead of hundreds of years.

It may, indeed, be said that the civilisation of the people of the British Islands has been in a great measure owing to the example and instruction of other European nations more advanced than themselves. This has no doubt been the case, but, on the other hand, the Japanese have had a corresponding advantage, as far as the most civilised Asiatic people could bestow it ; for they have certainly derived some of their arts, the most esteemed of their religions, and the whole of their literature from the Chinese.

The second example which I shall adduce will consist of a comparison between the people of Continental Greece and those of the Island of Java. Their countries are very nearly of the same extent. Their climates are indeed widely different, but we have a right to believe that they are equally suited to the well-being of the races that respectively inhabit them, and who, since we know nothing to the contrary, must be deemed their aborigines, for we have no evidence of their being otherwise. Java, in point of fertility, far surpasses most countries, equalling even those which are fertilised by the periodical inundations of great rivers, such as Egypt and Bengal. Greece, a mountainous country of narrow valleys and narrow plains, is not eminent for fertility. Java at least equals Greece even in point of the picturesque, for it has many mountains far higher than Olympus, volcanos in action, and forest-clad valleys of eminent beauty. It does not, like Greece, produce wheat and flax, or the vine and the olive, but it produces their equivalents, rice and cotton, palms, and the sugar-cane. Its coasts, like those of Greece, abound in fish, which, as it did with the Greeks, forms the chief animal food of its inhabitants.



For the fostering of maritime enterprise, Java seems to be on a level with Greece. The sea which surrounds it is not vexed even with such tempests as those of the Mediterranean, and it has the advantage of the monsoons, which enable the mariner, even without the compass, to make a long and rapid voyage by dispensing with the necessity of creeping tediously in sight of the shore. If Greece had the benefit of the neighbourhood of the many islands of the Grecian Archipelago, Java has that of a far superior one in the countless islands of the greater Archipelago to which it belongs, and even of the neighbouring Philippines.

Nothing was wanting to complete, not the equality, but the superiority of Java as a locality for fostering civilisation but the race of man, and here the superiority of Greece was more than enough to counterbalance its disadvantages of physical geography, as evinced by its arts, its literature, and its spirit of enterprise. The Greeks colonised all the islands of the Grecian Archipelago; while Java has not done so with any one island of the Malayan Archipelago, not even with those in the immediate vicinity. The Greeks planted colonies along all the coasts of the Mediterranean and Euxine, while the remote settlements and trade of the Javanese are only to be discovered by the existence of a few words of their language in the languages of less cultivated tribes, reaching indeed to a great distance, since we discover them without difficulty, on one side in the language of the remotest of the isles of the Pacific, and on the other in the languages of distant Madagascar.

From the facts stated in the course of this paper, the inevitable conclusion to which we must come is that between the European and Asiatic races of man there is a broad innate difference, physical, intellectual, and moral; that such difference has existed from the earliest authentic records, and is most probably coeval with the first creation of man.